
Logistics Management Institute

Improved Processes
for Facility Management
at the U.S. Immigration and
Naturalization Service

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

IN602R1

July 1997

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Karen M. Dahut
Michael B. Berger
Trevor L. Neve
Thomas P. Wilson

19970825 045

LMI

Improved Processes for Facility Management at the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service

IN602R1

July 1997

Karen M. Dahut
Michael B. Berger
Trevor L. Neve
Thomas P. Wilson

Prepared pursuant to Department of Defense Contract DASW01-95-C-0019. The views expressed here are those of the Logistics Management Institute at the time of issue but not necessarily those of the Department of Defense. Permission to quote or reproduce any part except for government purposes must be obtained from the Logistics Management Institute.

LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
2000 CORPORATE RIDGE
MCLEAN, VIRGINIA 22102-7805

Improved Processes for Facility Management
at the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service

IN602R1/JULY 1997

Executive Summary

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), an agency of the Department of Justice, is responsible for enforcing the laws regulating the admission of foreign-born persons (i.e., aliens) to the United States, as well as for administering various immigration benefits, including the naturalization of resident aliens.

Unique to the Service is the dual mission of providing information and service to the general public, while concurrently exercising its enforcement responsibilities to control and guard the borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens so that the health, welfare, safety, and security of the people of the United States are protected.

In support of its challenging mission, the INS owns and leases, either directly or through the General Services Administration, facilities at more than 600 sites nationwide. The buildings are widely dispersed and may be located in a remote border area or in a city. Furthermore, they range from single, mobile, highway checkpoints to large complexes that house service processing centers, Border Patrol stations, and ports of entry. Finally, the buildings have varied uses. For instance, some are commercial office space, while others resemble prisons and police stations.

Managing those facilities, both owned and leased, is a complex undertaking. Not only must INS's facility management (FM) staff keep track of the entire inventory of INS buildings, making sure that they are properly operated and maintained, but it must also plan and oversee each new construction or repair and alteration project. Facility management at INS has been confounded by underfunding in the past and, more recently, by a renewed focus on immigration-related issues that is straining INS facilities, as well as by an outdated and ineffective FM system.

INS needs a comprehensive, up-to-date FM system to ensure that it can meet its facility needs well into the future. Toward that end, the Logistics Management Institute identified a number of changes that INS should make that will enable it to capitalize on private-industry successes while preserving the effective parts of its existing system.

Specifically, we recommend that INS do the following:

- ◆ Adopt an FM focus
- ◆ Implement a structured and disciplined FM system
- ◆ Establish a budget and accounting system that will support a modern FM system
- ◆ Adopt a general facility management strategy
- ◆ Develop and follow an organizational master plan and facility management plans that support that master plan
- ◆ Expedite the implementation of a computer-aided facility management system.

While developing our recommendations, we worked closely with the INS Facility Management Working Group (which comprised representatives from INS headquarters, the regional offices, and the field offices) to ensure that we accounted for perspectives at all levels of the INS. We believe that, when implemented, the changes we recommend will substantially improve facility management at INS.

We recognize that many of the changes we propose will require a cultural change within the Service. Moving facility management from an afterthought to a fundamental operational strategy will be neither easy nor quick. However, it can be done with education and a concerted effort over the long term. The effort must have senior management support since it will affect many aspects of INS management outside of the FM community.

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1-1
TASK	1-2
STUDY APPROACH	1-2
REPORT ORGANIZATION.....	1-3
Chapter 2 Current Facilities Practices	2-1
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	2-1
General	2-1
Facilities Requirements.....	2-3
Personnel and Staffing	2-4
Budgeting and Accounting.....	2-4
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR PRACTICES	2-6
Project Planning	2-6
Staffing.....	2-7
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	2-7
Chapter 3 Opportunities for Improving Facility Management	3-1
FACILITY MANAGEMENT FOCUS	3-1
Introducing an FM Focus	3-2
Practical Steps Toward an FM Focus	3-3
STRUCTURE AND DISCIPLINE.....	3-5
Roles and Responsibilities	3-6
Oversight Bodies.....	3-8
MASTER PLANNING.....	3-8
FACILITY STRATEGY	3-9
COMPUTER-AIDED FACILITY MANAGEMENT	3-10
BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.....	3-10

Chapter 4 Recommendations.....	4-1
ADOPT A FACILITY MANAGEMENT FOCUS	4-1
IMPLEMENT A STRUCTURED AND DISCIPLINED FACILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	4-3
ESTABLISH A BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM THAT WILL SUPPORT A MODERN FM SYSTEM.....	4-4
ADOPT A GENERAL FACILITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	4-4
DEVELOP AND FOLLOW AN ORGANIZATIONAL MASTER PLAN.....	4-5
EXPEDITE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPUTER-AIDED FACILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	4-5
NEED FOR CULTURAL CHANGE	4-6

Appendix: Abbreviations

Chapter 1

Introduction

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), an agency of the Department of Justice, is responsible for enforcing the laws regulating the admission of foreign-born persons (i.e., aliens) to the United States, as well as for administering various immigration benefits, including the naturalization of resident aliens.

Unique to the Service is the dual mission of providing information and service to the general public, while concurrently exercising its enforcement responsibilities to control and guard the borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens so that the health, welfare, safety, and security of the people of the United States are protected.

INS has four major areas of responsibility: facilitating the entry of legally admissible visitors or immigrants to the United States; granting benefits under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, including providing assistance to those seeking permanent resident status or naturalization; preventing unlawful entry, employment, or receipt of benefits by those who are not entitled to them; and apprehending or removing those aliens who enter or remain illegally in the United States, as well as aliens whose stay is not in the public interest. The Service also has a firm commitment to strengthen criminal investigations and seek the most effective deterrents to illegal immigration.

The operational and management functions of the INS are organized among executive divisions at headquarters in Washington, DC: Programs, Field Operations, Policy and Planning, and Management. On the operational side, Programs oversees all enforcement and examination functions, and Field Operations provides executive direction to all field offices around the world. On the management side, Policy and Planning is responsible for all activities related to developing and disseminating policy, setting goals and priorities, analyzing and reporting statistics, and other cross-program initiatives. Management oversees all activities that provide technical or administrative support for INS operations.

Because its mission is nationwide, INS also has three regional offices and numerous field offices. The field offices include district offices, which oversee suboffices, service processing centers (SPCs), and air, land, and sea ports of entry (POEs), and Border Patrol sector headquarters (BPSHs), which oversee Border Patrol stations (BPSs), highway checkpoints, etc.

In support of its challenging mission, the INS owns and leases, either directly or through the General Services Administration (GSA), facilities at more than 600 sites nationwide. The buildings are widely dispersed and may be located in a

remote border area or in a city. Furthermore, they range from single, mobile, highway checkpoints to large complexes that host SPCs, BPSs, and POEs. Finally, the buildings have varied uses. For instance, some are commercial office space, while others resemble prisons and police stations.

Managing INS facilities, both owned and leased, is a complex undertaking. Not only must INS's facility management (FM) staff keep track of the entire inventory of INS buildings, making sure that they are properly operated and maintained, but it must also plan and oversee each new construction or repair and alteration (R&A) project. Lease negotiations are another important FM function.

Facility management at INS has been confounded by the lack of an effective FM system. Moreover, in the past, it has been underfunded, particularly in the areas of maintenance and R&A, and in recent years, it has been strained by the increasing demand on INS operations. With the renewed focus on immigration-related issues, the INS budget increased 69 percent from FY93 to FY96, and is expected to increase another 41 percent from FY96 to FY98. The increased funding has resulted in increased staffing, which in turn has created requirements for upgraded and new facilities, such as larger BPSs to house the increased number of Border Patrol agents. Similarly, the influx of people crossing the borders has created requirements for upgraded and new facilities, including new SPCs to house illegal aliens. Meeting these new requirements will add to the complexity of facility management at INS, particularly since INS's current processes for managing its facilities are outdated, obsolete, and, in some cases, nonexistent.

TASK

To ensure that it can meet its facility needs well into the future, INS has recognized that it needs a more effective FM system. It therefore asked the Logistics Management Institute to assist it with developing new, improved business processes for providing construction, repair, alteration, operations, and maintenance services. The improved processes are intended to provide the framework for a comprehensive FM system at all levels of the organization—headquarters, regional offices, and field offices. Specifically, INS asked that we review INS's existing facility management processes and recommend improvements that take advantage of lessons learned in the private sector while also encompassing the unique requirements of the INS.

STUDY APPROACH

We began the task by visiting more than 35 INS facilities, including regional offices and administrative centers, district offices, SPCs, POEs, BPSHs, and BPSs. Our purpose was to gain an in-depth understanding of existing FM processes in place to manage INS's complex facilities. During our site visits, we interviewed more than 100 people varying in seniority and expertise—journeymen

and managers, Border Patrol agents and agents in charge, and facility managers and maintenance personnel. We also reviewed the existing INS information systems and observed various field office personnel while they performed their daily work. In addition, we reviewed the materials they produce as a routine part of their jobs and the processes they must go through in order to execute tasks.

We established an INS Facility Management Working Group comprising representatives from INS headquarters, the regional offices, and the field offices. The Working Group included INS facilities personnel from around the country, as well as individuals involved in detention and deportation, border patrol, inspections, field operations, and engineering programs. The Working Group worked with us to delineate INS's existing FM processes, to identify weaknesses associated with those processes, and to develop solutions. Most important, we relied on the Working Group to ensure that we accounted for perspectives at all levels of the INS.

Our next step was to review industry practices regarding FM. We assessed processes in place in private industry that permit efficient, effective facility management. In particular, we were interested in finding out how other companies with national responsibilities manage their facilities functions. Our objective was to see how they might apply to INS.

From the lessons learned from industry, input from the Working Group, and our understanding and knowledge of FM, we identified a number of changes that INS should make to improve its FM processes substantially. The improved processes incorporate private-sector successes while recognizing and preserving the effective parts of INS's existing system.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report conveys the results of our work. In Chapter 2, we summarize the information we obtained during our site visits and interviews with INS staff. We focus on three aspects of facility management practices at INS: program management, maintenance and repair (M&R) practices, and project management. In Chapter 3, we discuss opportunities for improving the INS FM system; where relevant, the discussion includes information about processes used in the private sector. Finally, Chapter 4 presents six general recommendations for improving INS's FM system. We also identify a number of specific actions that INS should take to implement our recommendations.

Chapter 2

Current Facilities Practices

During our site visits and interviews with INS staff, we obtained a great deal of information about various aspects of facility management at INS. We focused on three areas: how the overall program is managed, how maintenance and repairs are accomplished, and how facility projects are managed.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

General

INS manages its facilities largely through ad hoc arrangements and informal relationships among the staff and with outside organizations. It does not act through consistent processes, established procedures, or clear lines of responsibility and communication, which are required for the efficient and effective management of a national network of hundreds of facilities.

We found that INS does not adhere to a comprehensive facility planning process. Although INS headquarters has prepared some facility management plans (which INS calls “master plans”) for INS-owned facilities, INS does not consistently incorporate the information in the plans into its decision-making processes. For example, we found that INS headquarters, regions, and field offices do not regularly request funds for the projects that the facility master plans identify as high priorities. In many cases, we found that the locations studied in the facility master plans do not have copies of the plans, or do not use them to plan facility-related spending.

We also observed a general lack of planning. For example, some INS organizations planned to move into new space later in the fiscal year but have not yet lined up funding to pay for the costs of moving and of purchasing new furniture. Given the long lead-times in the federal budget process, these costs should have been identified and budgeted 18 months in advance.

We found that INS does not establish clear priorities among competing uses of facility funds, and the regions do not prioritize their facility requests to headquarters. Also, we observed that headquarters does not set clear priorities among competing uses for facility funds. For example, rather than compiling a single, prioritized list of INS facility requirements, INS creates different lists for different programs to comply with budget formulation and budget requests and requirements, instead of focusing on the facility program priorities. The practice of developing different priority lists makes it impossible to determine which priorities

are the highest for INS as a whole. Normally, an organization should allocate scarce facility funds to its highest priorities.

Field offices generally do not have a full understanding of the standard components of the federal budget process, i.e., developing a budget request 18 months in advance, planning the implementation of the coming year's budget, and implementing the current year's budget. Field offices reported that they frequently respond to requests for budget information, but often do not have a clear sense of why the information is being requested and how it will be used.

We found that INS lacks the tools needed to manage hundreds of facilities. For example, INS headquarters and regional offices do not maintain current, accurate databases that contain the most basic information about their facilities, such as the street address and whether the space is owned by INS, leased directly by INS, assigned by GSA, or made available to INS through other means.¹

INS employees in the field responsible for facilities issues as a primary or collateral duty do not have a well-defined view of the roles and responsibilities of their office, the regional offices, and INS headquarters. For example, when a need for facility funds arises, the local staff often contacts "anyone who will listen" to a request for funds: the facilities staff at the regional office, the facilities staff at INS headquarters, the program staff at the regional office, the program staff at INS headquarters, and former colleagues anywhere in INS who might have access to funds.

We did not find this confusion about roles to be solely the field's perception. The roles and responsibilities of staff responsible for facilities at INS headquarters, the regional offices, and the field offices are not well defined or broadly understood. For example, it is not clear to the field when INS headquarters will play an active role in implementing a project versus when headquarters will expect lower levels of the organization to implement projects on their own.

We observed that many INS employees in the field who are responsible for facilities work do not know the INS standard procedures for requesting new office space or for obtaining funds for a major R&A project. The sections of the INS administrative manual that describe facility-related procedures are out of date and seldom used. INS staff in the field said that they would use the administrative manual if it were current.

We found that INS's processes for ensuring compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act are a barrier to efficient operations. Davis-Bacon requires a comparison of contractors' proposed wage rates with prevailing local wage rates, as determined by the Department of Labor, for all construction contract actions above \$2,500. The three INS regional offices require the region's contracting office to handle all Davis-Bacon contracts. As a result, field offices are able to complete contract

¹ We are aware that INS plans to prepare an authoritative database of its facilities in FY98.

actions for only the smallest facilities projects, and the regions are burdened with many small facility contracting actions.

Communications among headquarters, the regional offices, and the field offices are problematic. Field offices said repeatedly that they encounter difficulty obtaining answers to questions that they forward to higher levels of the organization. We observed the absence of routine communications about facilities work between regions and field offices. Field offices and regions stated that they often are required to respond within unrealistically short deadlines to unanticipated requests for information from higher levels, and that the purposes of such requests frequently are unclear. People we interviewed at all levels of the organization expressed frustration that individuals at other levels of the organization do not respond in a timely manner to telephone messages or electronic mail.

Facilities Requirements

INS staff at several locations described how facility designs do not meet their operational requirements. In some cases, facility users stated that they had not been consulted in the design process, or were not experienced enough to participate in the design process effectively. In other cases, facility users' comments on proposed designs were ignored.

We observed how some designs did not incorporate the requirements of the facility's end users:

- ◆ In many facilities we visited, the number of employees had grown faster than the facility's ability to absorb them; we observed overcrowded office space, locker areas, and parking lots. We also observed instances in which files and sensitive equipment were stored outdoors in military surplus shipping containers.
- ◆ A dormitory at one SPC has no emergency power generators. During power outages, doors are locked automatically. Without generators that would enable the staff to unlock the doors, a small number of guards may be confined with up to 180 detainees, creating a security concern.
- ◆ Decorative tiles protruding from the facade of a building at the same SPC also are a security concern. The tiles make it easy for detainees to climb onto the roof.
- ◆ In one two-story office structure that was built for INS, all stairwells in the building connect office space on the second floor to a building exit on the first floor. To go from floor to floor, INS staff must use the elevators or exit the building from one door and reenter at another door.

INS staff also noted that additional facility space would enhance their operations. For example, shortages of space at SPCs impede Border Patrol operations. In another example, the Dallas District Office does not have suboffices located in east or west Texas. As a result, those seeking INS services must travel to Dallas, which places a burden on both the Dallas facility and the individuals who must travel hundreds of miles to get there.

We found that INS does not plan growth in facilities to match growth in personnel and equipment. For example, we found that INS field offices did not learn of the number of new employees that they would receive in FY96 until the middle of that fiscal year. Obtaining information on the number of new staff members so close to the time of their arrival makes it almost impossible to complete necessary facility actions, such as altering existing space or obtaining new space, before the new staff arrives. We found the same problem regarding equipment. We observed floors that sagged under the weight of new communications equipment, electrical circuits that were overburdened by the loads created by new computers, and vehicles that had sustained damage from vandalism and storms because of inadequate parking facilities.

Personnel and Staffing

INS does not appear to view facility management as a distinct professional discipline that can help the Service achieve its strategic objectives. Rather, our sense is that hiring and training facilities personnel at regions and in the field has not been a high priority.

INS staff with facility-related responsibilities have widely varying levels of relevant experience. We observed some INS locations with experienced facility managers and staffs. Overall, however, field program staff with FM responsibilities lack training, experience, or expertise in facility management. We observed locations where administrative officers with little or no formal training in facilities are responsible not only for facilities, but also for other demanding functions such as personnel and contracting. We observed other sites where responsibility for facility management had changed hands frequently.

Most of those we interviewed in the field are eager to take advantage of training opportunities that would improve their knowledge of facility management or their technical skills. Most stated that they had not been offered such opportunities.

Budgeting and Accounting

The INS budget process makes cost-effective management of INS facilities difficult. Those we interviewed at INS headquarters said that major construction projects overrun their initial budget projections, principally because of changes in scope after the project has been funded. INS R&A budgets have traditionally been based on the number of employees, rather than on a thorough assessment of INS

requirements for repairs, alterations, and maintenance. INS has never explicitly budgeted for the substantial costs of maintaining and repairing border roads, fences, and lights.

The timing of the entire federal budget process requires INS to identify funding requirements up to 18 months in advance. We found that INS could do a much better job of identifying key costs 2 years in advance. Such costs could include renewals for expiring leases, moving and other one-time costs, and major alterations and renovations. Our interviews suggest that INS offices typically scramble for these funds during the current budget year, rather than budgeting for them 18 months in advance.

The INS budget process does not do a good job of allocating facility resources to field offices. Several locations reported to us that they have not received facility funding (Program Code 3260) for years and, therefore, that they have to use program operating funds to pay for their facility work. INS staff at a number of locations stated that the budget allocation process appeared to be haphazard. For example, field offices do not know the status of their requests for facility funds; as a result, they submit requests for the same projects over and over. Moreover, they are given little advance notice when funding does become available, which makes it difficult to execute the projects, and they no longer receive a small pool of discretionary funds to pay for everyday facility expenses.

INS does not know how much it spends on facilities. INS organizations bring a variety of resources to bear on their facility needs. They use construction and engineering funds (Program Code 3260) and funds from other INS programs (border patrol, detention and deportation, inspections, investigations, etc.) to pay for facility-related purchases. Labor is performed by INS facility staff, other INS staff such as Border Patrol agents, other government staff such as National Guard personnel, and private contractors. INS does not track how much all of these resources combined contribute to its facility efforts.

INS maintains good records on some expense categories, such as purchased materials and services. However, INS does not track the amount of program operating funds spent on facilities work or the value of labor performed by INS facility staff, other INS staff, and other government personnel.

For some major expenses, INS headquarters does not have the capability to make detailed comparisons of proposed spending with actual spending. INS develops budgets using one set of information and collects another set of information on actual expenses. For example, INS headquarters develops budgets for R&A based on the number of personnel in each INS program. INS executes the budget by providing funds for individual projects. It has no mechanism to compare the two. This arrangement impedes the effective management of INS resources.

Although a more detailed assessment is warranted, our site visits suggest that facility funding has been too low in the past and the backlog of facilities requirements has increased substantially. We observed some truly appalling working conditions. Although some facilities are adequate, we encountered many facilities with major health and safety code problems, such as overcrowded detention cells, the lack of sprinklers for fire protection, the lack of emergency lighting, and substandard electrical systems, as well as public service areas that are far too small. We saw new vehicles that were not in use because a shortage of vehicle maintenance space had prevented the installation of INS-unique equipment. The effective work of INS staff in such environments is a tribute to their dedication and “can-do” attitude.

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR PRACTICES

We found wide variation in M&R practices. We visited some facilities that are adequately maintained, but we visited many more where it was clear that M&R work has been delayed. We saw cracked facades on buildings, office trailers that are falling apart, roads that are in poor condition, and cracked sidewalks at SPCs that could cause INS staff or detainees to trip and fall.

Project Planning

We found that each INS location has created its own system for planning and carrying out routine maintenance, requesting repairs, and tracking progress. The vast majority of the sites we visited rely on paper-based processes to manage M&R work. For example, facility staffs use logs kept in notebooks, 3- by 5-inch index cards, and written forms to manage M&R work.

The majority of those we interviewed at field offices use program operating funds and their own staff to carry out preventive maintenance and small repair projects. Many stated that they prefer to complete facilities projects by purchasing materials and using their own labor. Among other things, this arrangement permits the field offices to complete facilities work without relying on the regional office to complete the contract actions. (As noted above, the regions require that their own procurement offices handle construction contracts that exceed the Davis–Bacon Act threshold of \$2,500.)

Field offices use their own funds and labor to maintain border roads, fences, and lights, and that these costs are not reflected in their operating budgets. In fact, we found that many field offices do not know the basic information that is required to develop budgets for M&R, such as the miles of border fencing and roads that they maintain. The construction and repair of border fencing appears to consume a particularly large share of staff time and unbudgeted resources.

We found that field offices do not use information in the INS facility master plans to develop local M&R plans or budgets. Among other things, the master plans indicate health and safety items that should be fixed immediately. In theory, the field office staffs could use this information to plan local facility spending. We did not find this to be the case in practice, however. In many cases, the staff at locations that had been included in the facility master plans recall participating in the process, but indicated that they either never received or are not using the published facility master plans.

Staffing

Although a more detailed assessment is warranted, our general impression from the site visits is that M&R functions are understaffed in many locations. For example, Border Patrol agents perform facility tasks, such as repairing fences and erecting small buildings, because that is the only way the needed facility work will get done. These tasks would be performed more appropriately by the facilities staff or contractors. If such support were available, the agents would be freed to carry out the operational duties they are trained to perform.

We also noted that the facility staffs at some locations appear to be stretched thin because they have been detailed to complete construction projects, or because they have to drive long distances to work at outlying locations.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

In general, INS does not make effective use of information technology to manage facility projects.

INS headquarters does not use an integrated information system to manage and track construction or large R&A projects. All of the offices we visited at INS headquarters have up-to-date personal computers connected via a network. We observed widespread use of spreadsheet and database applications, but their use is usually limited to a single purpose, e.g., a spreadsheet for developing the construction budget. The various spreadsheets and databases are not integrated with each other or with other relevant INS information systems. For example, INS uses the FIRM (Foundation for Information Real Property Management) system in its lease processes, but this software is not integrated with other INS information systems. Headquarters personnel informed us that they do not use the existing FRANCS (Facilities Renovation and New Construction System) database and that the facility module in the planned AMIS (Asset Management Information System) software is not yet available. We observed that INS headquarters processes requests for new construction and new leases via paper.

INS regional offices do not use an integrated information system to manage their facility work. Almost all of the field locations that we visited have up-to-date

personal computers and standard office software applications. Computers at many field offices are connected via a network to the regions and INS headquarters. We observed that different locations communicated with each other via electronic mail.

Although most of the field locations we visited have up-to-date computers and software, we observed little effective use of computers in M&R management. Almost all locations use paper-based processes to plan and manage M&R work. A few locations use spreadsheets and databases to manage some M&R work. Even at these locations, however, the computer-based systems handle only a fraction of the tasks that are normally included in commercial off-the-shelf, facility management software products. We observed one location that has started to use specialized software to manage its M&R workload.

Chapter 3

Opportunities for Improving Facility Management

Many opportunities exist for improving facility management at INS. In particular, facility management at INS is not as effective as it could be because the Service lacks

- ◆ management focus on facilities;
- ◆ structure and discipline—standard procedures, defined responsibilities, and clear lines of authority;
- ◆ an INS master plan that specifies long-term corporate goals, a mid-term (5–6 years) facility management plan, followed by a yearly facility management plan;
- ◆ a formal facility strategy;
- ◆ a computer-aided facility management (CAFM) system; and
- ◆ a budget and accounting system that can support a modern FM system.

In this chapter, we discuss each of those areas and suggest how they could be improved.

FACILITY MANAGEMENT FOCUS

Over the past 15 years in both the public and private sectors, facility management has developed into a professional discipline that has taken its place alongside of finance, human resources, and similar core functions in a modern organization. Senior managers have realized that a large proportion of an organization's resources go toward providing and maintaining its facilities. Moreover, because facilities have such an effect on operations and employee morale, FM has become the focus of much of management's attention. The FM system has become one of the primary components of organizational procedures, and much of an organization's business revolves around, or at least interacts with, that system. The most important step that INS could take to improve its facilities is to apply such an FM focus to its handling of facility matters.

The current INS focus for handling facilities is on budgets and funding rather than FM. Approval authorities are based on sources of funds, not on the scope of work. For example, at INS, R&A refers to a funds source, not a facility project type. R&A funds may be used for scopes of work ranging from minor operations and

maintenance (O&M) work to major projects. Moreover, all or part of the project may be funded from accounts other than R&A. The term R&A is therefore not suitable to use as a work category for programming and approvals.

Using funding categories to manage work has meant that the total costs of facility projects are not captured in one place. Facility projects often have several funding sources. For example, a project could have some materials purchased with R&A funds, have donated labor from the Army Reserve, and be supplemented by program funds. It is even conceivable that funds from the “one-time” budget could also contribute to the project.

Introducing an FM Focus

To introduce an FM focus, facility project programming, review, and approval should be based on the project’s capacity to affect the functionality of the facility. Organizations typically do not want field-level components making major decisions that will cost a lot of money, affect a lot of people, or reflect on the entire organization. On the other hand, senior management should not want to be involved with routine facility work requests. Work should therefore be categorized by work scope regardless of the source of funds for the work. Scope is usually defined by the type of work (i.e., maintenance, repair, construction, and possibly alteration) and the estimated total cost of doing it. Dollar thresholds are usually established in each work category to determine who can approve the work.

It is important to capture all costs for a facility project in one place so that project costs can be separated from other organizational costs. FM costs can then be compared with industry benchmarks and the cost experience of other government and private-sector organizations. Management decisions often depend on pure facility cost information. For example, the historical cost of in-house FM versus the cost of FM provided by lessors may affect lease-versus-buy decisions. Also, Congress and other oversight bodies often require answers that depend on pure facility costs. Most importantly, however, a thorough knowledge of total facility costs will add immeasurably to budget justifications, lend credibility to budget requests, and likely lead to better FM funding.

When capturing facility costs, a distinction must be made between a “project” and a “facility project.” A project may be an undertaking to open a new branch office. Such an undertaking would include a facility project to construct a building or alter a leased building, but it would also include other non-real-property costs such as additional staffing, furniture, moving, and perhaps the first year’s lease. It is extremely important to plan and budget for all of those requirements simultaneously and to ensure that they are well coordinated. However, it is also important to distinguish the pure facility requirements as a separate subcategory called “facility project.” Only then can meaningful benchmarking be applied.

In addition to the practical side of an FM focus, the cultural aspect is equally important. The quality of FM can be improved by centering facility planning and thinking on engineering requirements and consequences first, then worrying about the source of funds to support the need. Needed maintenance, repairs, and additions to facilities must be documented even when funds may not be available in the foreseeable future. Conversely, budget-centered FM can produce some counterproductive and harmful results. For example, approvals based on source of funds, instead of the type of work and its total estimated costs, allow major work to be done on facilities without the needed oversight. Also, it is hard to coordinate FM work when it is “stovepiped” by source of funds.

Based on the same rationale, work in leased and GSA-assigned facilities and INS-owned facilities should have to follow the same INS approval and control system. Facility work (or the lack of it) can affect occupants’ productivity and morale just as much in leased facilities as in owned ones. Although requests for work in facilities with different ownership (INS owned versus INS leased versus GSA assigned) follow different paths once they leave the INS, the initial steps should be essentially the same: identify the need, justify it, plan it, coordinate it with all those who will be affected by it, produce a good cost estimate for it, have it reviewed by competent engineering authority, and ensure that it fits in with the organization’s master plan and does not conflict with or duplicate other work. Those steps are essential no matter where the work is to be done or who is paying for it. (Public funds should be spent just as wisely in leased as in owned facilities.) Fixating on the ownership of the facility discourages the proper perspective and analysis for the requested work. For example, lease-versus-owned and lease-versus-release alternatives should be examined, and whether the benefit justifies the expenditure should be analyzed regardless of the source of funds. Moreover, having entirely different internal FM systems for different forms of ownership produces confusion and conflict.

Practical Steps Toward an FM Focus

Although applying an FM focus to facility matters is as much a cultural change as a practical one, INS can take several steps to help bring it about. First, INS should use FM definitions and protocols common in the profession. For example, staff at all levels must come to recognize that the definition of “facilities” includes not just buildings but fences, roads, storm drains, parking lots, landscaped gardens, sewer systems, and more. All of those assets must be recognized as an integral part of the FM program and must be routinely programmed and budgeted for. Also, terms such as O&M are preferred over INS terms such as building management.

The INS should define and manage work primarily by scope, not by funds source. Estimated cost (regardless of type and source of funds) and work classification should be used as the category discriminators. Typically, modern FM systems use

three categories of work, distinguished by approval categories or authorities and the degree of oversight needed:

- ◆ *Minor maintenance and repair work, including preventive maintenance.* This category, often called O&M work, typically allows a modest amount of new work such as installing an electrical outlet, installing a safety railing, and expanding the capacity of an air conditioning unit. It is neither efficient nor feasible for a regional office or headquarters to approve those small items of new work.
- ◆ *Medium-sized facility projects.* Typically, this category includes maintenance, repair, alteration, and some construction projects. However, the threshold for what defines a medium-sized project varies widely. The U.S. Postal Service uses \$100,000 as its upper threshold for R&A projects that can be approved and managed at the field level, while the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation allows its plant managers to approve repair, alteration, and construction projects up to \$2 million without reference to corporate headquarters.
- ◆ *Capital projects.* This category includes projects that will consume a substantial amount of an organization's resources, will affect operations, or will affect the entire company. Such projects require the equivalent of corporate headquarters approval and get the most senior management attention.

The INS Facility Management Working Group accepted the above categories of facility work, referring to them as Level I, Level II, and Level III, rather than using the common industry terms. The level numbers were later replaced with the terms O&M work, minor projects, and major projects to avoid potential confusion within INS. The Working Group also agreed to define the lower and upper thresholds of a minor project as \$25,000 and \$500,000, with some exceptions.

Using R&A to refer to minor projects was considered a problem by the Working Group because of the potential for confusion with INS's historical use of R&A to refer to a source of funds. The difficulties in naming the categories are related to a culture without an FM focus. INS management is finding it difficult to view projects according to their scope and not primarily from a budgetary viewpoint. However, such a differentiation is essential. Table 3-1 shows the relationship between size of project and potential sources of funding. Since each source of funds may be applied to more than one type of project, the funds source is a poor discriminator for managing facility work.

*Table 3-1. Relationship of Facility Projects
to Potential Sources of Funding*

Source	O&M work	Minor projects	Major projects
O&M	x	x	
R&A	x	x	x
Construction		x	x
Program	x	x	x

All new work (construction and alteration) should be differentiated from M&R. Major new work should be identified, approved, and tracked separately from M&R. This differentiation helps to prevent a problem that is common to both the public and private sectors: managers tend to spend a disproportionate amount of the FM budget on new work and allow M&R requirements to go unfunded. Left unguided, managers will continue to build facilities that they cannot afford to maintain while allowing continued deterioration of existing facilities. This tendency is particularly problematic for facilities such as sewage disposal systems that are out of sight.

Currently, work in leased and GSA-assigned facilities may not be funded with R&A funds because management believes that those funds are intended for government-owned facilities. How such work is to be funded is not altogether clear, but it appears that funds must come from program accounts or from the one time account that is primarily for initial occupancy fit outs and furniture buys. With the increased oversight that we have discussed above for such work, funding for work in leased and GSA-assigned facilities should also be channeled through the one-time outfitting cost account. All work in leased and GSA-assigned facilities would compete on its merits.

The coordination and approval for new facilities should be handled within the FM system. Currently, Field Operations at headquarters approves requests for new or expanded facilities outside of the FM system because of potential congressional repercussions. The involvement of Field Operations in such projects is entirely justified, but such projects still need engineering and scope reviews; cost estimating; feasibility analysis; security, safety, and environmental coordination; and all of the other safeguards that a sound FM system provides. Also, if approved, such projects still compete for funds with other FM projects, so handling them separately confounds decision-making.

STRUCTURE AND DISCIPLINE

Historically, INS has used an ad hoc approach to FM, which has created considerable confusion about roles and responsibilities. As it focuses on FM, management should take the opportunity to put an efficient and effective FM system in place by

establishing standard procedures, defined responsibilities, and clear lines of authority.

Roles and Responsibilities

One of the fundamental issues to address is how much to centralize the INS FM system. Organizations in the public and private sectors run the whole gamut from complete centralization at headquarters to considerable autonomy at the field level. The Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES), for example, has adopted a strong, centralized FM organization. Almost all of the approval authority, facility design, and funding is controlled by AAFES headquarters. At the other end of the spectrum, the military services' "regions" have construction approval authority of up to \$500,000; much of that authority is passed down to the installation level.

The INS, however, has neither the standardization of facilities and operations of AAFES (typical in the retail industry), nor the large budget of the Department of Defense. Facilities in some sectors, such as retailing, look almost identical and have much the same FM requirements and problems. In that case, it makes sense for FM authority to be centralized at corporate headquarters, albeit with a lot of travel to the field. The INS, on the other hand, has missions ranging from serving the public to apprehending and incarcerating people. It has a great variety of facilities, many of them leased, and its facility requirements are too varied, including differences between the northern and southern borders, and Caribbean Islands, to be effectively managed from a single location.

THE HEADQUARTERS' ROLE

Although operational management of INS facilities should be regionalized, policy management should be centralized at INS headquarters. Efficiency would benefit from uniform policies on how facility work is identified, justified, approved, funded, and executed even though those functions would be carried out by the regions. INS headquarters must be the agent to bring the needed structure to FM. Headquarters Facilities and Engineering Division (HQENG) should also continue trying to standardize facility designs wherever practical. Moreover, since the INS budget is modest compared to that of the Department of Defense, approval authority for projects estimated to cost \$500,000 or more should be retained at headquarters. Corporate approval for capital projects and for those that may have a substantial effect on the entire company is typically retained by headquarters in industry; that approach should be incorporated into the INS FM system. HQENG's responsibility for large and highly visible projects should pertain regardless of the source of the funds and the location for the work.

THE REGIONS' ROLE

The regional director should be responsible for the region's FM program and for the quality of the region's facilities. Each region should develop an FM plan that supports the INS goals and objectives. The region's FM staff should perform the feasibility and economic analyses for facility projects requested by the field and regional staffs. Moreover, the region should have responsibility for the identification, approval, and funding of the minor projects discussed above.

Giving the minor projects to the regions to handle should mean a faster and more tailored response to the region's facility needs. However, it also means giving the regions the funds to manage. Most of those projects are funded in what is currently called the R&A account. Each region should get annual R&A funding based on criteria established by headquarters. The region would then be responsible for spending those funds on its highest facility priorities, and the regional director would be held accountable for the adequacy and condition of his or her facilities.

In some cases, the authority given to the regions should be delegated further to the field. Some of the SPCs and BPSHs, for example, have the FM expertise and staffing to conduct cost estimates, feasibility analysis, and Davis-Bacon wage rate comparisons. The decisions on when to delegate FM authority should be left to the regions.

The region should also play an important role in managing capital projects. Although headquarters should retain primary responsibility and approval authority for those projects, each region should prioritize its needs and present headquarters with a well-coordinated priority list. Such a list from each region would be an important factor in the headquarters' decisions on which projects to approve or send forward for approval from higher authorities.

We recognize that FM staffing will probably have to be expanded at some regions to meet the new responsibilities. Each region has a large number of field operating locations, many of which have little FM expertise. Requirements at those locations often compete for funds. The regions must therefore play a larger role in managing their facilities and bringing the discipline needed to the system. Site visits will have to increase, and that travel is more likely to happen from a regional headquarters than from the national headquarters. Communication between the field and regions and between the regions and headquarters will have to improve. Current communications problems will be alleviated by a sound FM system and adequate FM staffing. However, we also recognize that a great deal of education and training in the new system is needed before the regions are ready to perform their new role.

Oversight Bodies

One of the first steps each region should take to bring discipline to the FM system and to accept its new FM role is to establish a Regional Facility Board (RFB). The board should be chaired by the regional director, and its members should comprise the regional program directors and the regional facility manager. Such a board would serve two purposes. First, it would foster a coordinated facility program and be more likely to give priority to those requirements that represent the region's highest facility needs. Second, involving the program directors in FM exposes them to facility needs and problems and fosters greater facility awareness. That, in turn, should improve regional FM planning for O&M work and minor projects.

A similar body should be established at headquarters. Called a facility steering committee (FSC), that body would serve the same two purposes outlined above but for capital projects at the headquarters level. The FSC should replace the current Construction Program Steering Committee and be given an expanded role. It should be chaired by the Assistant Commissioner for Administration, and its voting members should include the program assistant commissioners and representatives of Field Operations. The Director of HQENG should serve as the FSC's executive secretary. The FSC would call upon the expertise of the Office of Budget, information resources management staff, and others as needed.

MASTER PLANNING

INS has no single corporate document called the "Master Plan." The current documents called master plans are, in fact, regional facility management plans (although their geographic scopes do not always coincide with regional territories). The regional master plans are important documents, but do not address the facility requirements needed to support INS operational goals. INS needs a true master plan that lays out corporate strategic goals 6 to 20 years into the future.

Both HQENG and the regions should develop 5-year facility management plans for owned and leased facilities to support the strategic goals of the INS master plan and to implement the facility strategy discussed above. The facility management plans should list programmed projects; specify facility demolition, disposal, leasing, and expansion plans; and discuss any ramifications on facility management of goals delineated in the INS master plan. The plans should also specify FM goals for the next 5 years and discuss special facility programs such as initiatives to improve fire safety or quality of life or to comply with new environmental requirements. Annual multiyear FM budgets should be developed from the facility management plans. If projects and other FM requirements have been prioritized in the facility management plan, developing a budget should be greatly simplified. Note that facility management plans are primarily the facility managers' responsibility although operational managers should be directly involved. At the regional

level, that involvement should occur by means of the RFB. At INS headquarters, some of the involvement should be by means of the FSC. The adoption of facility management plans centered around regions and the increased involvement of operational managers should help solve the current problem of plans not being used.

The next lower level of planning is typically the annual work plan. Developed from each facility management plan, the annual work plan lays out the projected work for the year in much greater detail than does the facility management plan. Allocation of funds received is far more disciplined when a sound annual work plan has been prepared.

Planning at all levels, but especially master planning, has been made extremely difficult for the INS recently by rapid growth, frequent policy changes, and intense congressional interest. HQENG is gamely trying to develop a series of facility management plans, but the FM system that could implement them is not in place. Moreover, if an organization does not have a master plan, it is not possible to develop an effective facility management plan. The correct response to the constant changes, however, is not to abandon master planning in favor of crisis management, but to adapt that planning to a dynamic environment. Establishment of facility management boards and a facility steering committee should enable rapid coordination, review, and approval of work, as well as development of contingency plans for handling changes. In a dynamic environment, the risk of error is great and coordination and discipline are essential. Those elements can be achieved through a structured, disciplined, and well-understood FM system.

FACILITY STRATEGY

Most organizations find it beneficial to determine a general facility strategy that guides its facility management decisions, planning, and budgeting. Such a strategy lays out and prioritizes facility matters that are most important to the organization's leadership. The INS has no such facility strategy, so facility planning and actions tend to be ad hoc.

The nature of a facility strategy depends on an organization's mission, corporate culture, and facility needs. Typically, the strategy is determined or at least endorsed by senior management and published as a formal guide to the organization's decision-makers. For example, does maintaining existing infrastructure take precedence over new construction? Does improving environmental stewardship take precedence over improving the quality of life of the organization's work force? There is seldom enough money to take care of all the requirements in all of those areas, so some prioritization guidelines are needed.

The strategy is not intended to be blindly applied, since exceptions inevitably occur. Environmental stewardship may be rated low, for example, but when a new environmental law mandates a facility remedy, a suitable project will have to be funded before some of the organization's higher concerns. However, the facility

strategy should be readily apparent in the history of project funding and the facility decisions that are made.

The facility strategy serves as one of the bases of facility management planning, discussed above.

COMPUTER-AIDED FACILITY MANAGEMENT

INS does not use information technology effectively for facility-related tasks. To manage its facilities requirements, projects, and resources more effectively and efficiently, INS needs a single, comprehensive CAFM system usable at all levels of the organization—headquarters, regional offices, and field offices. A CAFM system is indispensable for properly managing any large, modern FM program. Typically, such systems consist of modules for accomplishing functions such as space, project, and lease management; asset and inventory control; and maintenance and work-order management. In addition, they enable managers to generate reports, conduct on-line reviews, and answer queries.

Management needs the visibility of FM requirements and programmed work that a CAFM can provide; customers also would benefit from the FM efficiencies a CAFM could provide, e.g., expedited work reviews and approvals. Finally, all of INS would benefit from the standardization and discipline that a CAFM imposes, e.g., in establishing a project record in the system so that it need not be resubmitted each year it is not funded. In short, one of the greatest opportunities to improve facility management at INS is to automate it.

BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

The INS budgeting and accounting system is poorly suited for FM needs. Funding for FM requirements is chaotic. For example, the cost of fitting out a newly leased facility and buying furniture for it is a common requirement that can be predicted quite far in advance. However, INS does not budget for such one-time costs; instead, it relies on funds taken from the program budgets at the beginning of each fiscal year. Because the programs guard their money jealously, the amount taken is often not enough to cover the commitments made for one-time requirements. Similarly, O&M requirements are not budgeted for or funded separately, so O&M projects do not get done unless money can be cajoled from the programs.

Providing adequate maintenance and repair to INS facilities demands that funds be set aside in a separate unique account for the purpose at the beginning of the fiscal year. Managers should not be able to use the funds for purposes unrelated to FM without the consent of the most senior INS management. With more FM funding available, the quality of INS facilities should improve steadily. Moreover, when facility managers know the amount of funds that will be available for the

fiscal year, they will be able to do a much better job of choosing alternative maintenance and repair options.

Once FM funding is set aside and protected, a more structured, disciplined budget process is needed to ensure that the FM accounts are adequately funded. For instance, HQENG should improve the development of the President's annual budget request by striving to identify and budget for all facility requirements at least 2 years in advance. Requirements that should be budgeted 2 years in advance include new construction projects, one-time outfitting costs, the R&A and O&M programs, and lease actions. While such long lead-times are sure to create some uncertainties, they are essential given the length of the entire federal budget process.

HQENG should also develop budgets for the 3 years following the year covered by the President's annual budget request (i.e., 5 years from the current year). Deteriorating facilities, M&R backlogs, inefficient use of highly trained personnel, and ultimately, reduced operational effectiveness are the price organizations pay for failing to anticipate and plan for facility costs in advance.

An improved budget process should also replace the modular cost method for establishing R&A budgets. The modular cost method sets R&A funding levels based on the number of employees in INS programs. In practice, R&A requirements are less a function of employment levels and more a function of the specific characteristics of INS facilities: their age, size, complexity, type of construction, intensity of use, mechanical and electrical systems, state of upkeep, distance from one another, and local climate. In addition, some expensive INS FM responsibilities, such as the need to maintain and repair border fences and roads, have no connection whatsoever to employment levels. The modular cost method should be replaced by an annual, bottom-up assessment of INS R&A and O&M requirements.

Cost estimates in budget requests for major construction projects would be improved if INS funded 15 percent designs for the projects before submitting its budget request to the Department of Justice. Funding such designs would increase confidence in the accuracy of INS budget estimates.

INS should establish systems and practices that provide a full accounting of facility costs. Currently, INS data on facility costs do not include the value of INS labor (such as the time of Border Patrol agents performing facility work) and labor donated by other organizations (such as National Guard units). Sound management principles dictate that INS understand these and all of the costs associated with its facilities efforts.

Once the new budget process is installed, HQENG should train those in the field with facility-related responsibilities. Such training would be an essential element for success of the new process.

Chapter 4

Recommendations

To update its facility management system, INS should focus on improving five processes. Specifically, it should do the following:

- ◆ Adopt an FM focus for facility-related matters
- ◆ Implement a structured and disciplined FM system
- ◆ Establish a budget and accounting system that will support a modern FM system
- ◆ Adopt a general facility management strategy
- ◆ Develop and follow an organizational master plan
- ◆ Expedite the implementation of a CAFM system.

In this chapter, we identify a number of specific actions that INS should take to implement each of these general recommendations.

While developing these recommendations, we worked with the INS Facility Management Working Group; that Group supported and further developed the majority of them. Recommendations not addressed by the Working Group are noted in the discussion below.

ADOPT A FACILITY MANAGEMENT FOCUS

There is no one thing that INS can do to immediately adopt an FM focus for the way it handles facility matters. It will take a change of attitudes about facilities throughout the entire organization, a respect for FM as a distinct professional discipline, and myriad small changes to procedures and policies. It will also take time and a cultural change. We recommend that INS take the following concrete steps to begin the process:

- ◆ *Adopt FM terms and definitions that are common to the discipline and not unique to INS.* Manuals and correspondence should be written using those terms and definitions.

-
- ◆ *Define and manage facility work primarily by scope and only then by funding source.* We recommend three work categories:
 - O&M work is work that can be approved by field activities. The Working Group defined O&M work as encompassing M&R work requests estimated at \$25,000 or less. We recommend that, in addition, field activities be given approval authority for new work (construction and alteration) estimated at \$2,000 or less.
 - Minor projects are medium-sized facility projects, currently funded primarily from R&A funds that must be approved by the regional office. The Working Group defined minor projects as projects estimated to cost between \$25,000 and \$500,000, regardless of fund source. We recommend that, in addition, the definition apply both to work in INS-owned facilities and to work that is an INS responsibility in leased or GSA-assigned facilities. Minor projects do not include work that will result in additional space or a change of facility use unless the facility is owned by INS; will have less than 10,000 gross square feet; will be sited within an existing INS compound; and will be a storage facility, warehouse, or other similar facility.
 - Major projects are what the FM industry commonly calls capital projects approved by headquarters. They are maintenance, repair, construction, or alteration projects, on one or more facilities, with an estimated cost of more than \$500,000 (regardless of fund source), or projects that will result in additional space or a change of facility use, regardless of cost. The facility project may be for INS-owned facilities or for “above standard or allocation” requirements on facilities not owned by the INS. Construction of some smaller facilities are exempted from classification as major projects as described above.
 - ◆ *Require that all work requests—whether for INS owned, leased, or GSA-assigned facilities—be processed through the same system of internal review, coordination, and approval.* The procedures will vary somewhat with ownership (for example, cost estimates for work in GSA-assigned facilities will have to be made by the GSA region as well as by INS), but the essential elements should pertain.
 - ◆ *Handle requests for new space within the FM system.* The participation of Field Operations is essential but should not force a separate system of facility review and approval.

IMPLEMENT A STRUCTURED AND DISCIPLINED FACILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

INS should take a number of actions to incorporate structure and discipline in its FM system. They include the following:

- ◆ *Centralize FM at the region.* Minor projects should be approved and managed at the regional level. R&A funds, which will fund the majority of minor projects, should be passed to the regions to manage. Regions should develop facility management plans, concur on requests for major projects, and act as the primary points of contact with INS headquarters for facility matters.
- ◆ *Establish regional facility boards.* Each region should establish a regional facility board to help administer its new responsibilities. The board would approve minor projects, authorize R&A funding for minor projects and their designs, set priorities for the region's requests for major projects, approve facility management plans and budgets, determine the size of any regional R&A contingency fund, monitor facility project funding obligation and execution rates, and review regional FM policies.
- ◆ *Establish a facility steering committee.* INS headquarters should establish an FSC to help administer FM responsibilities. The FSC would approve major projects within INS funding authority, set priorities for major projects outside of INS funding authority, approve headquarters facility management plans and budgets, coordinate on FM inputs to any INS organizational master plans, determine the size of any headquarters R&A contingency fund, approve and prioritize requests for one-time outfitting costs, monitor facility project funding obligation and execution rates, and review INS FM policies.
- ◆ *Review FM staffing to ensure that resources are available to manage the new FM system.* Although not part of the scope of this study, we noted that FM staffing at all levels of the INS appeared low for the number and type of facility assets they have to manage. An in-depth, detailed review is needed to determine the numbers and types of FM staff required.
- ◆ *Develop performance measures for the new FM system once it is operational.* To manage effectively, management must be able to measure performance. HQENG should identify the most important attributes of its FM system and develop performance measures for them. The system's performance should then be routinely compared with those performance measures, and any shortcomings should be identified for management action.

ESTABLISH A BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SYSTEM THAT WILL SUPPORT A MODERN FM SYSTEM

To ensure that its budget and accounting system supports its updated facility management system, INS should do the following:

- ◆ *Reserve FM funds.* Funds for FM should be set aside on several categories. Funds for O&M and R&A should be budgeted for and isolated *before* funds are allocated to the programs (border patrol, detention and deportation, inspections, etc.). The O&M and R&A money should be set aside so that it is not susceptible to diversion to non-FM uses. INS should continue to allow managers to use program funds for O&M and R&A projects when O&M and R&A funding is unavailable. However, we recommend that the INS redesignate program funds (to Program Code 3260.005 funds) to facilitate the accounting of facility expenses.
- ◆ *Include all FM requirements in FM budget requests and begin documenting budget requirements at least 2 years in advance.* Budget requests should include new construction projects, one-time outfitting costs, the O&M and R&A programs, and lease actions.
- ◆ *Replace the current modular cost method for establishing R&A budgets with an annual bottom-up assessment of INS O&M and R&A requirements.* In practice, R&A requirements are less a function of employment levels and more a function of the specific characteristics of INS facilities.
- ◆ *Account for the cost of all resources used for FM.* For example, the accounting system should be structured to account for the cost of donated labor.
- ◆ *Budget for and provide funds to produce 15 percent designs for major construction projects before those projects are included in the INS budget request.* Funding such designs would increase confidence in the accuracy of INS budget estimates.

ADOPT A GENERAL FACILITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

INS senior management should agree on a general facility management strategy that will guide FM decision-making at all organizational levels. The strategy should be drafted by HQENG and presented to senior managers for their concurrence and support. One of the forums to present and debate the strategy is the Facility Steering Group.

The strategy should include a general priority for INS facility work. Based on the FM strategies we have seen from other organizations and our knowledge of INS requirements, we suggest the following priority:

- ◆ Maintain existing infrastructure
- ◆ House new missions
- ◆ Optimize public and private resources
- ◆ Support quality of life
- ◆ Improve environmental stewardship.

DEVELOP AND FOLLOW AN ORGANIZATIONAL MASTER PLAN

The documents currently called master plans are an excellent start on the long-term planning process needed at INS. However, INS needs a more complete solution. Specifically, it should do the following:

- ◆ *Develop a comprehensive organizational master plan.* Development of such a plan is the responsibility of INS senior management. However, HQENG should have input into that plan, which would then serve as the basis for the regional facility plans to support it.
- ◆ *Continue developing the facility management plans, currently called master plans.* Those plans should support the long-term requirements laid out in the organizational master plan. Responsibility for their development should be given to the regions to increase the likelihood that the regions will follow them.

EXPEDITE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPUTER-AIDED FACILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

INS recently identified a CAFM system that meets its FM functional requirements. To expedite the implementation of that system, INS should take the following actions:

- ◆ Acquire the hardware and software as soon as possible
- ◆ Begin gathering data and making other preparations necessary to begin testing the system as soon as it is acquired.

Since it will be at least 18 months before all components of the CAFM system can be purchased and installed throughout INS, we recommend that, in the interim, INS use the project tracking database developed by the Logistics Management Institute. Not only would the database enable more effective project tracking until the CAFM system takes over, but it would serve as a useful precursor for the CAFM system. Headquarters, regional, and field FM staffs would gather project data for the interim system, and those data would be directly transferable to the CAFM system, expediting the CAFM implementation. In addition, the interim system would provide the staff with valuable training and insight in working with an automated FM system.

NEED FOR CULTURAL CHANGE

We recognize that many of the changes we recommend will not come about without a cultural change within the INS. Adopting an FM focus, for example, will require fundamental cultural change within INS's FM community as well as INS as a whole; developing and following an organizational master plan is needed before effective facility management plans can be developed and followed.

Moving facilities from an afterthought to a fundamental operational strategy will neither be easy nor quick. However, it can be done with education and a concerted effort over the long term. The effort must have senior management support since it will affect many aspects of INS management outside of the FM community.

Appendix

Abbreviations

AAFES	Army and Air Force Exchange Service
AMIS	Asset Management Information System
BPS	Border Patrol station
BPSH	Border Patrol sector headquarters
CAFM	computer-aided facility management
FIRM	Foundation for Information Real Property Management
FM	facility management
FMP	Facility Master Plan
FRANCS	Facilities Renovation and New Construction System
FSC	facility steering committee
GSA	General Services Administration
HQENG	HQ Facilities and Engineering Division
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service
M&R	maintenance and repair
O&M	operations and maintenance
POE	port of entry
R&A	repair and alteration
RFB	Regional Facility Board
SPC	service processing center

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OPM No.0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources gathering, and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE Jul 97	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Improved Processes for Facility Management at the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service			5. FUNDING NUMBERS C DASW01-95-C-0019 PE 0902198D	
6. AUTHOR(S) Karen M. Dahut, Michael B. Berger, Trevor L. Neve, Thomas P. Wilson				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Logistics Management Institute 2000 Corporate Ridge McLean, VA 22102-7805			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER LMI- IN602R1	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Mr. David Yentzer, Assistant Commissioner INSHQADM, Room 2100 425 "I" Street Washington, DC 20536			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, an agency of the Department of Justice, is responsible for enforcing the laws regulating the admission of foreign-born persons (i.e., aliens) to the United States, as well as for administering various immigration benefits, including the naturalization of resident aliens. In support of its challenging mission, the INS owns and leases, either directly or through the General Services Administration, facilities at more than 600 sites nationwide. Managing those facilities is a complex undertaking that has been confounded by underfunding in the past and, more recently, by a renewed focus on immigration-related issues that is straining INS facilities, as well as by an outdated and ineffective facility management system. This report identifies a number of changes that will substantially improve FM at INS. It recommends that INS adopt an FM focus, implement a structured and disciplined FM system, establish a budget and accounting system that will support a modern FM system, develop and follow an organizational master plan, and expedite the implementation of a computer-aided facility management system. The changes will enable INS to capitalize on private-industry successes while preserving the effective parts of its existing system.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Immigration and Naturalization Service, facility management, CAFM, business process improvement			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 38	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	